

THE BOON'S LICK TIMES.

JAMES R. BENSON & CLARK H. GREEN,
Publishers and Proprietors.

TERMS.

THIS PAPER is published weekly, at \$3 in advance, or \$4 at the end of the year. No paper will be discontinued but at the option of the Editors until all arrears are paid—and a failure to give notice of a wish to discontinue will be considered a new engagement.

Rates of Advertising.

One dollar per square, of twelve lines, or less, for the first insertion, and fifty cents a square for each subsequent insertion.

For one square 12 months twenty dollars.

Merchants or others advertising by the year, to the amount of fifty dollars and upwards, will be entitled to a deduction of one third, where a regular agreement is entered into.

Where the insertion of an advertisement is ordered, without the number of insertions being specified, it will be inserted, (in the discretion of the proprietors) until forbad, and charged for accordingly.

All advertisements from strangers, as well as all orders for job-work, must be accompanied with the cash, or a reference to some responsible and convenient acquaintance.

SPEECH OF MR. OGLE, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

On the Civil and Diplomatic Appropriation Bill,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.
[Continued.]

The President's House, from the time of its destruction in 1814, was not refurnished and occupied until Sept., 1817. It was then taken possession of by Mr. Monroe. The furniture in the former building had been destroyed with it, and the little that had been purchased afterwards, for the accommodation of President Madison, in the house which had been rented for him, (the eastern end of the Seven Buildings), was only second hand furniture, and of trifling value; there was not a carpet in the house, the floor having been covered with blue and green baize, which was entirely worn out; indeed, it is said there was not an article of furniture used by Mr. Madison suited to the new building. Mr. Monroe, however, had considerable furniture, of good quality, most of which he had procured abroad as American Minister, and the residue for his accommodation as Secretary of State. This furniture, including a small service of plate, he placed in the President's house, at a valuation of (\$9,721 22) fixed upon it by two of the most respectable citizens of the District. About the same period, an order, limited in amount to twelve thousand dollars, was transmitted by Mr. Monroe to Messrs. Russell and La Farge, at Harve, with instructions to procure some articles of furniture, "strong, massive, and durable," to be manufactured for the rooms for which they were respectively intended. These gentlemen, acting under the erroneous impression that the house of the President was to be furnished in the style of the king's palace, devoted greatly to the instruction of Mr. Monroe, not only in the richness and splendor of the articles purchased, but actually ran up their bills to \$2,085,85 francs, or \$18,417 17, being \$6,417 17 higher than the extent of the order which they had received. All this splendid French furniture was forthwith shipped to America, and Congress subsequently granted the necessary appropriation to cover the deficit. Although Mr. Monroe was somewhat unfortunate in the selection of his agents, he was little to blame in the whole affair; for many of the articles deemed necessary for the President's House could not at that day have been procured in the United States; and, besides, the statute which directs "that all furniture purchased for the President's house shall be, as far as practicable, of American or domestic manufacture," was not enacted until May 22, 1826. The furniture of the President's house was further increased by the purchase of articles in Philadelphia and other Atlantic cities, from time to time during the administration of Mr. Monroe, amounting to \$22,511 601. The entire sum, therefore, invested in furniture by him was \$50,000, viz:

Private furniture, appraised at	\$9,071 22
Bought in France,	18,417 17
Purchased in Philadelphia, &c.,	22,511 60
\$50,000 00	

This sum was paid by three several appropriations bills passed by Congress, to-wit:

March 3, 1817, for	\$20,000
April 20, 1818, for	20,000
April 20, 1818, for deficiency,	10,000
\$50,000	

To the rich stock bought by Mr. Monroe, there was added, during the administration of John Q. Adams, other furniture, including a service of plate, taken from Mr. Crawford at the time he left Washington, upon retiring from the head of the Treasury Department, all of which amounted to the sum of \$20,000, and for which Congress had granted the necessary appropriations, viz:

February 25, 1825,	\$14,000
March 2, 1827,	6,000

The entire cost, therefore, of the furniture in the President's house on the day the reformers took possession, was precisely \$70,000. But all the fine things which had been gathered into the palace by Monroe and Adams were not grand enough for our reformers; they must be provided with huge barn-doors size mantel and pier mirrors, in golden frames; magnificent cut-glass chandeliers, royal and imperial Wiltons, Italian gold slab pier tables, golden stans, golden rays, Turkish divans, French comfortable, foreign cut wine coolers, barrel-shape flute decanters, with cone stoppers, and one hundred droll artificial flowers. Our reformers would not be satisfied without the dulcet notes of the rosewood piano forte, (octaves); nor could they enjoy their French cookery without the zest of a golden spoon. Oh! how they longed after the genuine democratic gold and silver service of the Russian Baron, Le General Baron de Tuyl. Hence our reformers have expended seventy thousand six hundred and eighty dollars and forty cents to purchase all these lococofo baubles. The furniture, therefore, at the present time, in the President's palace, cost the People the sum of \$140,680 40. What, sir, will the plain farmers of the country say—what will our industrious and frugal mechanics say—what will the poor daily laborers say, about the expenditure of \$140,680 40 in providing furniture for one house—and such furniture! Is there a lococofo within this Hall of the People's Representatives who will justify this extravagance? If there be, I do pronounce him as the tool of the Executive. The plain republican citizens of the United States will not excuse Martin Van Buren for paying for a bunch of artificial flowers, to adorn his table, a larger sum than the yearly wages of a poor hireling; ay, sir, more than the annual pension granted by the nation to the brave and heroic soldier who endured the seven years' toil of our revolutionary struggle.

Immediately after the installation at N. York

BOON'S LICK TIMES.

"ERROR CEASES TO BE DANGEROUS, WHEN REASON IS LEFT FREE TO COMBAT IT"—JEFFERSON.

Vol. I.

FAYETTE, MISSOURI, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1840.

No. 27.

in 1789, of Gen. Washington as President, under the new Constitution, he took possession of the House in Pearl street, in which the President of the Old Congress had resided. After the removal of the seat of Government to Philadelphia, President Washington lived in a house in Market street, in that city, which had been leased by Robert Morris to the Government, at an annual rent of \$3,000. The rents and all the other expenses of the President's establishment were paid out of the Treasury, but General Washington received no pay whatever for his services. On the contrary, he considered that he was in duty bound to relinquish to the people of the U. States two hundred thousand dollars, the amount of his salary for eight years' services as President, in consideration of the rents and other expenditures incurred by the nation in maintaining his establishment while in their service. How does the conduct of George Washington contrast on this subject with that of Martin Van Buren? Washington and Van Buren! Bless my soul, what a falling off! [Loud laughter.] Yes, what a fell was there, my countrymen! Then you and I, and all of us fell down. After looking back, down the long line of illustrious worthies who have occupied the Presidential chair in this country, is it not enough to make the heart of a patriot bleed, and to cover his cheek with blushes, to see in what that illustrious line ends! What has Martin Van Buren ever done? Who can tell me? I can inform you, sir, he has not only taken twenty-five thousand dollars in gold and silver, for his annual salary, but he has compelled the People to pay for HEMMING HIS DISH-RAGS into the bargain. Why, sir, he knows no more of the honorable and high-minded feelings of a patriot than he does of the hardships of a soldier. I think I can tell about all he knows on that subject; and it is expressed in the nightly prayer of an Irishman impressed as a marine: "God be thanked that I never killed any body; and that nobody ever killed me! God bless the world, and huzza for the navy!" [Loud laughter.] I do not see why it is that such a nation as this should ever have made so much of so small a pattern of a man. He never originated anything to benefit his country, he never fought to secure her glory; he has done nothing but plot to elevate himself; and yet we all throw into turmoil about one little man, as if he was a hero or a statesman—as if, in the hour of his country's extremity he had been the first to face her foes and present his body to their bullets; and when her danger was past, had retired, like Cincinnatus, to his plough, and had shown yet more in all the peaceful virtues of private life than he had been shown in the field. Placed by the side of Harrison, what is he and what has he done? Let him read General Harrison's letter to Bolivar, when that pure-minded patriot pointed out to the great liberator the path of true glory and immortal fame, recommending him to take Washington for his model, and to become, like him, the father of his country. This would have sent him down to posterity with a shining brow. My soul rejoices that we are at last going to have a President something like the Father of the Revolution. Why did the American People advance Gen. Washington to the Presidency? Because he had been the Father of his country, living and acting only for her. Why did they then choose the elder Adams? Because he had been the eloquent defender of Independence; because his loving words had stirred the fire and blood in the hearts of his countrymen, and had inspired them to do and die in the cause of freedom. Why did they make Jefferson their Chief Magistrate? Because he had been the eloquent writer of the Declaration of Independence. And why Madison? Because he had been the able, the profound expounder of the Constitution. Why Monroe? Because he was the last of that band of worthies who had shed their blood in our Revolutionary struggle. With him ended the revolutionary race. Why had they then appointed John Q. Adams? Because of his diplomatic experience, his known political wisdom. Why Jackson? Let New Orleans answer. And why Martin Van Buren? Ask answers, why? It is true he put on General Jackson's coat, and drew on his heavy military boots, and tried to stride into his footsteps, and that is about all.

I had a mind to turn the attention of this committee to a description of Martin Van Buren, by his loving friend and cousin, Alexander H. Everett of Massachusetts, but I will not do it—the man is small enough already. Let his friends here point out any one act he ever did to benefit his country—let them lay their finger on one single bright page in his annals which has ever been illuminated by deeds of his. When we would talk of Harrison, we can say, and say truly to all the People of the Northwest: he was a father to your country. He saved it from a savage foe. He made all the Indian treaties by which you hold your lands in peace, and he promoted the improvement and well being of all your settlements after he had first rendered them secure. Under his government there was no Indian war, like the contest in Florida, hatched in fraud, and prosecuted in reckless improvidence. The Indians themselves admitted the fairness and equity of all his proceedings. They could rely on his word; they trusted his sincerity; no army was there to march to remove them from the lands they had sold to the white man; they retired voluntarily and peacefully. But how is it now? You cannot negotiate a single Indian treaty, but what your democratic commissioners turn out to be such fraudulent rascals that the Indians all complain that they are cheated, and being themselves for the most part men of uprightness and integrity, they become indignant at the wrong, and set your power at defiance. What was the history of your Creek war? How did it originate? and were you not obliged to remove the Cherokees by the bayonet, thus compelling them to observe a treaty they had never made? Is there not at this hour a storm brewing amongst the Winnebagoes in the north-west, because, like the Seminoles, they were cheated in a treaty? It will not do to saddle the blame of the wars upon the Indians; and when charged with all the millions you have spent, to say: we cannot help it—it is not our fault. You could have helped it, and it is your fault. Your own abominable frauds and oppressions were the cause of the war, and you are justly chargeable with every dollar it has cost the People.

But, sir, I must come back for the present to the old grudge—the expenditures for the palace. On the 2d of March, 1794, Congress passed an act directing "decayed, out of repair, or unfit for use" furniture to be sold, and the proceeds of sale and so much of a sum as the President may judge necessary, not exceeding \$14,000, to be invested in new furniture for the use of the President (the

elder Adams.) In December, 1800, the Government was removed to its permanent seat at Washington, but before its removal, viz. 24th April, 1800, the sum of \$15,000 had been granted to provide "furniture for the house erected in Washington for the President, to be expended by heads of State, Treasury, war and navy." The furniture was subsequently increased by three several appropriations of \$14,000 each, by acts passed 2d March, 1805, 2d March, 1809, and 26th July, 1813, respectively. There had therefore, been expended on the furniture of the President's House from the time of its first occupancy in December, 1800, up to the period of its destruction by the British army, fifty-seven thousand dollars. I shall not descend to the basement story of the palace, and remark upon the furniture which appertains to the numerous rooms provided for the stewards, cooks and other servants, but content myself with the single declaration that all the arrangements upon the basement story are in exact harmony with the style and magnificence displayed in the other stories of the palace.

I have heard many improvements suggested by court favorites as proper for the interior of the palace, among which are the following: 1st, a library of gilt bound books; 2d, a cabinet or museum of medals, coins, gems, minerals, shells, plants, insects, worms, fishes, birds and beasts; 3d, a suite of rooms garnished with paintings by Titian, Rubens, Rembrandt, Raphael, Salvator, Ross, Vanduyke, Leonardo da Vinci, Carlo Dolce, Pompeo Battoni, Andrea Sacchi, and

"Correggio's Magdalen and Night,
The Matron of the Chair,
Guido's fleet couriers in their flight,
And Claude's least a pair."

These paintings would form a beautiful contrast with the charming French prints now understood to be within or near the place. All these improvements would of course be properly chargeable under the head of "alterations and repairs of the President's house." Other "alterations and repairs of the President's house," have doubtless been mooted, but with more abundant caution; these consist in the erection of a throne and the purchase of a crown, diadem, sceptre, and royal jewels. The pro and con arguments in regard to these alterations and repairs, readily suggest themselves. On the one side it may be contended that the introduction of these palace appendages might alarm the democracy; that, at most, they are but the empty ensigns of royalty; and that, at all events, it will be best not to agitate the matter until the Sub-treasury system shall be firmly established, and the projected law for raising a standing army of 200,000 men shall be fully enacted. On the other hand, it may with great propriety be alleged that, as we already have the palace, with its tabourets and other splendid regalia, palace grounds, palace gardens, grand levees, state banquets, Court ceremonials, Court costumes, stalls for the royal steeds, and royal revenues, we should not hesitate about a throne, which, according to the definition of Napoleon Bonaparte, is six plaques d'or et un tapis de velours—or six plaques and a velvet carpet. Why refuse a crown, which is merely a band of gold, with diamonds and precious stones set inouches, the ring being attached to a velvet gold embroidered cap, terminating on the top with a golden ball or cone? Why deny a diadem of richly variegated riband, forming the border of a velvet cap graced with gold tufts and tassels? Why reject a sceptre, or sickle, thirty inches in length, and lacerated with golden varnish? And as to the royal jewels, they are doubtless easily procured, under the excellent counsel of the twenty-two Kings, whose good wishes have heretofore been manifested in recommending to the favorable consideration of Mr. Van Buren the Independent Treasury. Moreover, there is not a letter, or syllable, or word, or clause, or section, or article, found in the constitution, which forbids the introduction of these regalia; then why hesitate? Will not the pseudo democracy be better pleased with a President who possesses not only the power, but is also covered with the trappings of royalty? Caesar was omnipotent at Rome, with the plain title of Consul; Cromwell, with the simple name of Protector, controlled all the power of England; Consul Bonaparte was as absolute and despotic as the Emperor Napoleon.

Sir, I am unwilling to grant the appropriation of \$3,665 in the bill under consideration, for alterations and repairs of the President's house, because the money may be expended in the erection of a throne within the Blue Elliptical Saloon, and for the purchase of a crown, diadem, sceptre, and royal jewels, with as little propriety as former appropriations, for alterations and repairs of the President's house, have been expended; and because, after these regalia shall have been prepared, it will not be very inconvenient for President Van Buren to exchange his splendid Spanish cloak for a royal stole, and, having placed the crown upon his head, the diadem on his brow, and bedecked his person with the royal jewels, with the lacerated sceptre in his hand, take his seat on that throne. And thus this democratic President, although deprived of the title of royalty, will be invested, not only with its prerogatives, but with its trappings also.

If, sir, it is inexpedient in these hard times to appropriate the money of the People for opening and improving harbors, for erecting light-houses, for constructing roads and canals, for improving the navigation of rivers, for completing the Cumberland road, and for other objects of real utility, I think the times are too hard to apply the cash of the People for alterations and repairs of the President's palace. I believe that the individual who now occupies that mansion, might suggest such alterations and repairs as would not meet the views of the gentleman who will occupy the same house on the 4th March next; and, as the building is in excellent condition—as it is as splendid as the palace of the Autocrat of all the Russias, and as richly adorned as the grandest oriental mansion, I think the present occupant might be contented with it, particularly as the furniture, since the accession of General Jackson, has cost the people of the United States no less a sum than \$70,080, and the palace grounds, and gardens, during the same period, the additional sum of \$88,722 58. This one would think, might, at all events, be sufficient to satisfy a plain, frugal, economical, hard-handed democrat. But whether he shall be satisfied or not, I hope the committee will not pass the bill in its present shape; for I do not think the People want any more slippery elms on the President's grounds—had rather see a good row of buckeyes.

Sir, I have been controlled in the remarks which I have deemed it my duty to submit in relation to the President's palace, by the same notions and principles which governed the Jackson party, of which I was an ardent supporter, during the administration of J. Q. Adams. You will doubtless recollect that the Jackson party at that day, both in and out of Congress, went into the investigation of the palace concerns most thoroughly. On the 3d of March, 1825, the following joint resolution was adopted by the two Houses:

"Resolved, &c., That the Commissioner of the Public Buildings be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to take an inventory of the furniture of the President's house, as such time as may be convenient to the President, and to deliver a copy thereof to the President elect, and one copy to each House of Congress."

In pursuance of this resolution, a schedule of all the furniture in the President's House, including the articles in the bed chambers and kitchen, was reported to Congress on the 5th of December, 1825. Subsequently, (8th February, 1826,) the House of Representatives, through its committee, requested the then President to communicate in what manner the last appropriation for furniture for the President's house, had been expended. After the information had been obtained, the committee made a report to the House, viz: 17th March, 1826, to which they not only annexed a memorandum of all the table linens, sheets, pillow cases, chamber towels, &c., in the palace, but also a list of all the articles purchased by Mr. Adams from the 10th of March, 1825, till January, 1826. Embraced in the list were the following items:

1825. May 26. Lagare Kervand, bill table, . . .	\$50 00
" June 6. Littlejohn, for cues, &c. &c.	6 00
" Dec. 20. B. F. Pomeroy, bill, bill balls, . . .	6 00
1826. Jan. 1. P. Thompson, chessmen, . . .	23 50
	\$84 50

Who does not remember the indignant bursts of eloquence that were then launched forth with in this hall against gambling, waste of time, neglect of public business, extravagance, &c. &c. With what commendable piety and holy zeal did the leading champions of retrenchment and reform at that day exhort all devout Christians to open their eyes and lend their ears to a full and thorough examination of these subjects! I have before me, sir, a speech on this subject, delivered on the 4th of February, 1826, by the Hon. JAMES BUCHANAN on Mr. Clinton's resolution to retrench the expenditures of the General Government, in which he elaborately discusses the merits of this enormous expenditure, and shows exceeding great regard for the scruples of the pious in regard to the purchase, with the public money, of instruments for amusement; an example of wastefulness and extravagance which he appears to have apprehended, "must have a most powerful and extensive influence upon the morals of the youth of our country."

It taxed out, indeed, in the end, that Mr. Adams had really paid for the billiard table, &c. out of his own pocket. But no matter: the Jackson party in Congress continued to denounce the purchase of the billiard table, balls, cues, and chessmen. These were the articles of palace furniture upon which we Jackson men arranged the Administration of Mr. Adams before the country. These articles of extravagance amounted to \$84 50. We were afraid to pay for a billiard table for the President to spend his precious time at, because he had so many important duties to perform. The arguments used at that time will tingle in the ears of the old Jackson men when they shall discover, what is the fact, that two hundred dollars have been paid for boot money on the exchange of a mahogany piano forte; for one constructed of rosewood, and that the very reformers who made such an everlasting din about the price of a billiard table, have expended more than seventy thousand dollars of the people's cash for nine-foot mirrors, gold knives, forks, spoons, rapiers, &c., not omitting, however, the bills for hemming Mr. Van Buren's dish rags and strainer cloths, and for grinding his servants' knives.

And now, sir, having seen that this democratic President's house is finished in a style of magnificence and regal splendor that might well satisfy a monarch, let us examine the manners, habits, conduct, and political principles of the person who dwells in it, and see if they correspond to the grandeur of the mansion. I do this to show the people some facts, from which they may judge whether this is that plain, simple, humble, hard-handed democrat, whom they have been taught to believe is at the head of the democratic party. Because the question now is, whether Martin Van Buren, of Kinderhook, is that real, bona fide, straight-going democrat which his friends avouch him to be. He may call himself a democrat—such, no doubt, he professes to be—but then there is a great difference between names and things. You have heard the story of the former's son, who said to his father, "Father, if I should call that calf a pig, how many legs would the calf have?" "Why, five, to be sure," said his father. "Why, no it wouldn't," says the boy, "because my calling it a pig wouldn't make it so." [Laughter.]

So, in this case, I strongly suspect that when we look a little closely, we shall find that the democratic leg is nothing but a tail, after all. [Loud laughter.]

On reading the *Diary in America*, by Captain Marryatt, of the Royal Navy of England, I was much struck with the sound discrimination exhibited by this distinguished traveler, in a paragraph at page 153 of the first volume of his work. I will read the passage:

"Mr. Van Buren is a very gentlemanlike, intelligent man, very proud of talking over his visit to England, and the English with whom he was acquainted. It is remarkable that, although at the head of the democratic party, Mr. Van Buren has taken a step striking at the very roots of their boasted equality, and one on which General Jackson did not venture, namely, he has prevented the democracy (democracy) from indulging themselves at his levees. The police are now stationed at the door, to prevent the intrusion of any improper person. A few years ago, a fellow would drive his cart or hackney coach up to the door, walk into the saloon in all his dirt, and force his way to the President, that he might shake him by the one hand, whilst he flourished his whip in the other. The revolting scenes which took place when effectresses were handed round, the injury done to the furniture, and the disgust to the ladies, may be well imagined. Mr. Van Buren deserves great credit for this step, for it was a bold one; but I

must not praise him too much, or he may lose his next election."

I could well anticipate that an English sea captain who had been reared among the haughty aristocracy of that proud country, and who had been accustomed to execute almost despotic power aboard his man-of-war, could show his strong British feelings by a hearty approval of the code of palace laws adopted by Mr. Van Buren, and by which he prevents "the democracy (democracy) from indulging themselves at his levees." I could also anticipate that this captain in the Royal Navy would manifest his abhorrence of the common people, by commanding, in suitable terms, the palace regulation, by which "the police are now stationed at the door to prevent the intrusion of any improper person." But what arrested, most particularly, my attention in reading the passage just quoted, was the remarkable fact displayed by the author in opening to his readers, in two or three lines, the inmost recesses of Mr. Van Buren's character and infamy. "HE IS VERY PROUD OF TALKING OVER HIS VISIT TO ENGLAND, AND THE ENGLISH WITH WHOM HE WAS ACQUAINTED." These are pregnant words, and furnish a key to explain many occurrences which have transpired since his elevation to the Presidency, and which have caused, in the minds of the old and true-hearted republicans of this country, amazement, if not grief and mortification. There was a time, in this land, when kings, and aristocrats, and noblemen, were not countenanced as they are now. There was a time when there was no such strong affinity between us and the monarchs on the other side of the Atlantic; there was a time when you would not find the son of a President of the United States invited and set down to the royal table in England before the highest nobleman in that land. Just look at it! Do you not see how we are growing in favor with the potentates of Europe? When Scott went to England he was taken by the hand in this way! No; he had whipped the British at Lumley's Lane, and at Bridgewater, too much. No; but when the son of President Van Buren goes there, he is put down by the side of Prince Esterhazy, and takes precedence even of the Duke of Wellington. I tell you we are growing in favor with crowned heads and countries. If we go on as we have been doing, we shall in time go through all the court nonsense and mummery that have disgraced Christendom for the last century. I say we look too much across the water. What is going on now! The President, and the Head of the Treasury Department, have both substantially told us that we ought to organize a system of collecting, keeping, and disbursing the public revenue after the manner in which the kings, tyrants, and despots of Europe keep their treasures. That is the recommendation—the despots of Europe have these substances, and therefore we ought to adopt the scheme for this country. The Secretary of War, too, has sent to Europe two young cavalry officers for what? Will some of the Democracy tell us what purpose the Secretary intends to answer by sending abroad two officers of his Department to examine into the history and uses of the European cavalry service? The Post-Master General also has his agents abroad. The last letter I saw from Mr. Agent Pitt is dated at Berlin. Probably he is learning, in the despatches of Prussia, how a system of espionage might be introduced here; how letters might be opened and seals broken; and how the correspondence of the President might be intercepted. I, for my part, do not like these intrusions upon the principles of our Revolutionary fathers. Why should we go abroad for such things? Look at our own country. Is it not as large as all Europe together? Has it not a soil sufficiently substantial and fertile to sustain a population equal to that of all Europe? Has it not within itself all the elements of greatness without needing abroad to look for them? I believe that if England and Europe were sunk in the Atlantic, this nation, instead of being impeded in her onward march, would have its high destiny accelerated. Have we not all the gems of prosperity that are to be found in Europe? Have we not gold and silver, and iron and copper, and zinc, and lead, and all the useful metals, in abundance? Have we not within our own borders cotton and wool, and hemp and flax, and

"Black shawl furs for winter's frosts,
And silk for summer fires?"
Do we not possess all the mows, grains, and vegetables of Europe? Do not our glorious forests furnish sublime specimens of the live oak, the white oak, the hickory, maple, walnut, beech, cucumber, not forgetting the buckeye, and even the slippery elm? Why, then, go abroad? Why are the members of Europe's two offices, each Department and messenger sent to learn wisdom? To see how despots are managed and conducted, and how the people are oppressed? If the object were to learn any thing which would tend to liberate our institutions, our messengers should have been sent to a country where they venerate the habeas corpus, the right of trial by jury, freedom of speech, and a free press. What is the true object of a monarchy? It is to secure insubordination to the person of the monarch; to give him uncontrolled sway; and all the institutions and laws of a monarchy are made to every into effect that object. Hence, in a monarchy you have the maxim that a King can do no wrong—that it is treason even to imagine his death. And every thing is made to bend to this will.

Our Democratic President ought not to go to lands where such such privileges exist. They are not in accordance with our institutions; they are manifestly subversive of the principles of all our institutions. Kings are no less rascals, tyrants, and despots now than they were in 1776. Why, then, should Mr. Van Buren be making friends in the way of Mammon, with these tyrants, despots, and rascals? Let us confine ourselves within our own charming country—our people have enough to do at home without going abroad. Let us preserve our own institutions, as handed down to us by our ever-to-be-remembered forefathers. But I am sorry to say, that Mr. Van Buren is in no wise governed by those good old-fashioned opinions of our Revolutionary fathers. No. He is determined that his sons shall have their manners refined; that they shall learn how to dress, dance, promenade, bow, chat, and look like the noblemen of England. I say look, because a full-blown aristocrat cannot recognize his next neighbor without the aid of an opera or quizzing glass. Several of Mr. Van Buren's sons were, therefore, sent across the blue waters to see for themselves how to ape the British aristocracy. Now let us turn your attention to some accounts we have had in the London journals, of the visit paid by his eldest son, John two years ago, to Queen Victoria. At a grand state dinner given by the Queen, at Buckingham Palace, on the evening of July 25th, we see John Van Buren, "son of the President of the United States," in the list of special and other ambassadors from Sovereigns. Here, sir, is the entire list, *verbatim et literatim*, from the London Courier, July 26th:

"Prince Nicholas Esterhazy; Prince Windisch Gratz; JOHN VAN BUREN, son of the President of the United States; the Lord Chancellor and Lady Cottenham; Dukes of Norfolk, Cleveland, Wellington, Sutherland, Argyll, and Devonshire; Duchess of Sutherland; Marquis and Marchioness of Lansdowne; Marquis of Conyngham; Marquis of Hertford; Earls of Minto, Grey, and Albemarle; Countess Charlotte; Viscount and Viscountess Howick; Viscount Melbourne; Viscount Palmerston; Lord and Lady John Russell; Lords Hill, Glenelg, Holland, and Pultney; Lady

Flora Hastings, the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Lady T. Spring Rice; Sir John Hobhouse, Sir Henry Whistley, Sir Hussey Vivian, the Right Hon. C. Poulett Thompson, Count and Countess Zavadowski, Count Alexis Stroganoff, Marquis of Dalmeida, Marquis de Alora, Hon. Miss Cockes, Hon. Miss Cavendish, Lady Caroline Barrington, Baroness Lettzen, Hon. C. A. Murray, Hon. Col. Cavendish, Hon. William Cowper, and Colonel Buckley."

Here, sir, you see that, in the estimation of the British Court Journal, John Van Buren, the eldest son of our democratic, hard-handed, lococofo President, outranks, at a state levee, Dukes, Marquises, Earls, Viscounts, and Barons. Our democratic President has got to be so great a favorite in England, that, when his son goes there, he is taken at once by the hand, and recognized as the son of one of the sovereigns. I wonder if Sam, Bang, or even Charles J. Ingersoll, would have been taken by the hand in this way. I wonder if they would have been thus received and seated at table to take precedence before Lord Wellington, and other *Knights of the Garter*, at this great state banquet.

Now, I do not know whether we plain democrats understand much of the science of levity; but in England they are precise in these things; to rank, as they are in the army. First comes the commander-in-chief, then the generals, major generals, brigadiers, colonels, majors, captains, lieutenants, ensigns—all by gradation. So in England, as to rank, first, is the wealthiest nobleman in Europe, Prince Esterhazy, the representative of one of the great continental Powers of Europe. Then you name Prince Windisch Gratz, a great nobleman, almost equally distinguished by his wealth and his titles with the former. Then you have the son of our democratic President. He goes before the conqueror of Waterloo—before Dukes of the royal blood—before Marquises, Earls, Viscounts, and Barons. You have him singly dove-tailed in between Prince Windisch Gratz and the Lord Chamberlain. Then come the Dukes of Norfolk, Cleveland, Wellington, Sutherland, Argyll, Devonshire, &c. &c. And this was the company. Very select, very select, I assure you.

Well, soon after this, the Lord Mayor and Corporation of London gave a splendid entertainment at Guildhall, to "His Britannic Majesty." At this sumptuous dinner, we have been informed that "600 pints of turtle soup, 40 hanches of venison, 2,000 fowls, 50 dishes of shell fish, 10 surloins of beef" were consumed. The London journals of the day announced that John Van Buren was "one of the chosen few at the Lord Mayor's right hand." Indeed, it appears that John Van Buren was seated and dined, and put on a par with the Duke of Cambridge, the Prince de Nemours, son of Louis Philippe, the CITIZEN King, and other "illustrissimi of Europe," simply because he is the son of Martin Van Buren, whom the potentates of the old world consider the democratic King of the new world.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot avoid presenting you the following graphic sketch of some of the distinguished hours conferred on our Prince, John Van Buren. It is from the pen of a lococofo editor, writing from London.

"My friend, young John Van Buren, is behaving very well here. He puts up at Long's fashionable hotel, in Bond street, and quizzes the English dandies most unmercifully. I understand also that the Queen is much better pleased with our Prince than with the white-haired son of royalty from France—I mean the Duc de Nemours, son of Louis Philippe, the CITIZEN King, and other "illustrissimi of Europe," simply because he is the son of Martin Van Buren, whom the potentates of the old world consider the democratic King of the new world.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot avoid presenting you the following graphic sketch of some of the distinguished hours conferred on our Prince, John Van Buren. It is from the pen of a lococofo editor, writing from London.

"My friend, young John Van Buren, is behaving very well here. He puts up at Long's fashionable hotel, in Bond street, and quizzes the English dandies most unmercifully. I understand also that the Queen is much better pleased with our Prince than with the white-haired son of royalty from France—I mean the Duc de Nemours, son of Louis Philippe, the CITIZEN King, and other "illustrissimi of Europe," simply because he is the son of Martin Van Buren, whom the potentates of the old world consider the democratic King of the new world.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot avoid presenting you the following graphic sketch of some of the distinguished hours conferred on our Prince, John Van Buren. It is from the pen of a lococofo editor, writing from London.